



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/711,324

09/10/2004

Uri Zernik

ZERNP004US

5323

27949 7590 05/01/2008
LAW OFFICE OF JAY R. YABLON
910 NORTHUMBERLAND DRIVE
SCHENECTADY, NY 12309-2814

EXAMINER

CHEMPAKASERIL, ANN J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2166

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/01/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/711,324	Applicant(s) ZERNIK, URI	
	Examiner ANN J. CHEMPAKASERIL	Art Unit 2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-104 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-104 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-104 are pending in the action.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-104 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s). Applicant's arguments are regarding amended claims which will be addressed in the rejection below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 7, 8, 11-18, 21-23, 25, 30, 33-38, 43-51, 57, 58, 61-68, 71-73, 75, 80, 83-88, and 93-104 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over by US Patent 6976214 issued to Bates et al (hereinafter "Bates") in view of US Patent Publication 20040193910 issued to Moles.

As per claims 1, 51 and 101, Bates discloses converting specific-case information to general-case information (the text editor program executes in memory to provide a GUI text editing tool [Column 3, lines 20-25], Text box 52a displays the located repeated terms in the passage in bold. The replace box 54a displays the term

highlighted in the text box 52a, e.g., "satisfaction" in FIG. 2, that the user may change with substitute terms [Column 3, lines 60-65], comprising the steps of:

identifying specific-case terms by scanning through at least one source document, using a computer processor (The composition program 14 searches specified portions of the document 16 for instances of repeated terms. [Column 3, lines 35-38]);

proposing substitutions of general-case terms for the identified specific- case terms in said at least one source document, also using said computer processor (The replace box 54a displays the term highlighted in the text box 52a, e.g., "satisfaction" in FIG. 2, that the user may change with substitute terms displayed in a "with" window 56a [Column 3, lines 61-65]);

and displaying the proposed substitutions for said at least one source document, on a computerized display device (Figure 2 exemplifies a display screen on a computerized display device showing the proposed substitutions for a source document [Fig. 2]), wherein:

Bates does not explicitly teach "said specific-case terms are not so-identified based upon a determination of which terms are repeated within said at least one source document; and said specific-case terms are so-identified without making use of HTML elements preexisting within said at least one source document."

Moles teaches the claimed said specific-case terms are not so-identified based upon a determination of which terms are repeated within said at least one source

document; and said specific-case terms are so-identified without making use of HTML elements preexisting within said at least one source document (the display filter identifies sensitive information by comparing words, numbers, and graphics appearing on display 185 with a list of words, numbers, and graphics stored in a sensitive information database. [0031]

Bates and Moles are analogous art because they both teach about sanitizing a sensitive document.

It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Bates and use a database of sensitive information as taught by Moles to identify sensitive information and filter them. Modification provides a way to obscure the sensitive information by replacing the sensitive information with at least one of replacement text and replacement graphics. [0017]

As per claims 7 and 57, Bates discloses comparing terms in said at least one source document with names in a name database (comparing terms and identifying Mark Twain from a group of literary figures [Column 4, lines 50-55]);

and identifying a term as a specific-case term based on said term matching a name in said name database (Identifying literary figure Mark Twain from within the group [Column 4, lines 50-55])

As per claims 8 and 58, Bates discloses deriving said name database from a corpus of a large number of documents of similar nature to said at least one source document (names in the literary group).

As per claims 11 and 61, Bates discloses, said step of identifying specific- case terms further comprising the steps of: identifying a particular section of said at least one source document as being a section customarily containing specific-case terms (The composition program 14 searches specified portions of the document 16 for instances of repeated terms. [Column 3, lines 35-40])

and identifying a term as a specific-case term based on said term being located in the identified particular section at a place customarily occupied by specific-case terms (The definition of a repeated term terms depends upon the unit of the document 16 the composition program 14 searches [Column 3, lines 35-40])

As per claims 12 and 62, Bates discloses comparing terms in said at least one source document with terms in a collocation database (comparing terms, such as terms used together, from various database [Column 4, lines 45-55]);

and identifying a term as a specific-case term based on said term matching a term in said collocation database (identifying associations and matching the terms from the selected association group [Column 4, lines 45-55]).

As per claims 13 and 63, Bates discloses deriving said collocation database from a corpus of a large number of documents of similar nature to said at least one source document (The database is derived from various sources such as the thesaurus, Shakespeare, the Bible as described. [Column 4, lines 55-65]).

As per claims 14 and 64, Bates discloses further identifying said term as a specific-case term based on the collocation of said term being used below a predetermined usage threshold (the association of words may be created by experts

knowledgeable in the field of the particular association group. Thus, predefined association groups would be provided for use with the composition program 14 [Column 5, lines 5-10]).

As per claims 15 and 65, Bates discloses establishing said predetermined usage threshold using a computerized input device (The association groups may be assembled using a text parsing program capable of determining words the association group treats as related [Column 5, lines 5-10]).

As per claims 16 and 66, Bates discloses comparing terms in said at least one source document with terms in a rare word database (comparing terms, such as terms used together, from various database, rare words such as literary groups, Biblical group and terms in the Shakespeare language [Column 4, lines 45-55]);

and identifying a term as a specific-case term based on said term matching a term in said rare word database, which is used below a predetermined usage threshold (the association of words may be created by experts knowledgeable in the field of the particular association group. Thus, predefined association groups would be provided for use with the composition program 14 [Column 5, lines 5-10]).

As per claims 17 and 67, Bates discloses deriving said rare word database from a corpus of a large number of documents of similar nature to said at least one source document (The database is derived from various sources such as the thesaurus, Shakespeare, the Bible as described. [Column 4, lines 55-65]).

As per claims 18 and 68, Bates discloses establishing said predetermined usage threshold using a computerized input device (The association groups may be

assembled using a text parsing program capable of determining words the association group treats as related [Column 5, lines 5-10]).

As per claims 21 and 71, Bates discloses undoing a proposed substitution previously selected by a user by designating a proposed substitution to be undone, using a computerized input device (Further, a term highlighted in the "current associations" box 86 may be removed from the group of words associated with the term in the "association with" box 84 by selecting the "delete" pushbutton 90. [Column 4, lines 27-31]).

As per claims 22 and 72, Bates discloses adding a substitution by designating a substitution to be added, using a computerized input device (If the user selects the "add word" graphical button 60 in FIGS. 2 and 3, then the "associate term" dialog box 80 would be displayed as shown in FIG. 4. The user may enter a word in the "enter term" edit box 82 to associate with the term in the "associate with" box 84. [Column 4, lines 10-15]).

As per claims 23 and 73, Bates discloses modifying a proposed substitution by designating a proposed substitution to be modified, using a computerized input device (If the user selects the "add word" graphical button 60 in FIGS. 2 and 3, then the "associate term" dialog box 80 would be displayed as shown in FIG. 4. The user may enter a word in the "enter term" edit box 82 to associate with the term in the "associate with" box 84. [Column 4, lines 10-15]);

and entering a modification to said proposed substitution, using said computerized input device (whenever the term in the "associate with" 84 box is

subsequently highlighted in the text box 52a, b (FIGS. 2, 3) as a repeated term, then the term added as an associated word through the "associate term" dialog box 80 will be displayed in the "with" box 56a, b in the com [Column 4, lines 32-37]).

As per claims 25 and 75, Bates discloses designating a proposed substitution on said computerized display device, using a computerized input device (designating proposed specific- case terms substitutions (56b) for general case term handicap (54b) [Fig. 3]);

in response to said designating, displaying the specific-case term for which said proposed substitution is proposed, on said computerized display device (FIG. 3 shows the dialog box 50b after the user selected the term "gratification" in the "with" box 56a in FIG. 2. In FIG. 3, the term "gratification" is shown in text box 52b, which is substituted for the previously highlighted term "satisfaction" in box 52a [Column 4, lines 4-10])

As per claims 30, 80, Bates discloses displaying said at least one source document on said computerized display device (Fig. 3 displays a source document on a computerized display device);

displaying within said at least one source document, said general-case terms proposed to be substituted for said specific-case terms (displaying proposed specific-case terms substitutions (56b) for general case term handicap (54b) [Fig. 3]);

and further displaying on said computerized display device, a list of said proposed substitutions listing said general-case terms in relation to said specific-case terms for which they are proposed to be substituted (list of all specific-case terms which they are proposed to be substituted (56b) [Fig. 3])

As per claims 33, 83, 102 Bates discloses displaying said at least one source document on said computerized display device (Fig. 3 displays a source document on a computerized display device);

displaying within said at least one source document, said general-case terms proposed to be substituted for said specific-case terms (displaying proposed specific-case terms substitutions (56b) for general case term handicap (54b) [Fig. 3]);

and further displaying on said computerized display device, a list of said proposed substitutions listing said general-case terms in relation to said specific-case terms for which they are proposed to be substituted (list of all specific-case terms which they are proposed to be substituted (56b) [Fig. 3])

Bates does not explicitly teach “said specific-case terms are not so-identified based upon a determination of which terms are repeated within said at least one source document; and said specific-case terms are so-identified without making use of HTML elements preexisting within said at least one source document.”

Moles teaches the claimed said specific-case terms are not so-identified based upon a determination of which terms are repeated within said at least one source document; and said specific-case terms are so-identified without making use of HTML elements preexisting within said at least one source document (the display filter identifies sensitive information by comparing words, numbers, and graphics appearing on display 185 with a list of words, numbers, and graphics stored in a sensitive information database. [0031]

Bates and Moles are analogous art because they both teach about sanitizing a sensitive document.

It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Bates and use a database of sensitive information as taught by Moles to identify sensitive information and filter them. Modification provides a way to obscure the sensitive information by replacing the sensitive information with at least one of replacement text and replacement graphics. [0017]

As per claims 34 and 84, Bates discloses further displaying for a particular general-case term and its related specific-case term, a numeric tally of how many times said particular general-case term is proposed to be substituted for said related specific-case term (52b shows the number of times general case of handicaps and satisfaction is proposed to be substituted for specific case terms shown on the list in 56a and 56b [Fig. 2 and 3]).

As per claim 35 and 85, Bates discloses undoing a proposed substitution previously selected by a user by designating a proposed substitution to be undone, using a computerized input device (Further, a term highlighted in the "current associations" box 86 may be removed from the group of words associated with the term in the "association with" box 84 by selecting the "delete" pushbutton 90. [Column 4, lines 27-31]).

As per claim 36 and 86, Bates discloses adding a substitution by designating a substitution to be added, using a computerized input device (If the user selects the "add word" graphical button 60 in FIGS. 2 and 3, then the "associate term" dialog box 80

would be displayed as shown in FIG. 4. The user may enter a word in the "enter term" edit box 82 to associate with the term in the "associate with" box 84. [Column 4, lines 10-15]).

As per claim 37 and 87, Bates discloses modifying a proposed substitution by designating a proposed substitution to be modified, using a computerized input device (If the user selects the "add word" graphical button 60 in FIGS. 2 and 3, then the "associate term" dialog box 80 would be displayed as shown in FIG. 4. The user may enter a word in the "enter term" edit box 82 to associate with the term in the "associate with" box 84. [Column 4, lines 10-15]);

and entering a modification to said proposed substitution, using said computerized input device (whenever the term in the "associate with" 84 box is subsequently highlighted in the text box 52a, b (FIGS. 2, 3) as a repeated term, then the term added as an associated word through the "associate term" dialog box 80 will be displayed in the "with" box 56a, b in the com [Column 4, lines 32-37]).

As per claim 38 and 88, Bates discloses designating a proposed substitution on said computerized display device, using a computerized input device (designating proposed specific- case terms substitutions (56b) for general case term handicap (54b) [Fig. 3]);

in response to said designating, displaying the specific-case term for which said proposed substitution is proposed, on said computerized display device (FIG. 3 shows the dialog box 50b after the user selected the term "gratification" in the "with" box 56a in

FIG. 2. In FIG. 3, the term "gratification" is shown in text box 52b, which is substituted for the previously highlighted term "satisfaction" in box 52a [Column 4, lines 4-10])

As per claims 43, 93, and 103, Bates discloses displaying at least part of said at least one source document on said computerized display device (Part of a source of said source document (52b) [Fig. 3]);

displaying within said at least one source document, said specific-case terms for which it is proposed to substitute said general-case terms (displaying proposed specific-case terms substitutions (56b) for general case term handicap (54b) [Fig. 3]);

further displaying on said computerized display device, at least part of a proposed substitution document (Part of a source of said at least one source document (52b) [Fig. 3]);

and displaying within said proposed substitution document, said proposed substitutions, with said specific-case terms juxtaposed relative to said general-case terms to facilitate comparison there between (list of all specific-case terms which they are proposed to be substituted which can be compared to find the right match (56b) [Fig. 3])

Bates does not explicitly teach "said specific-case terms are not so-identified based upon a determination of which terms are repeated within said at least one source document; and said specific-case terms are so-identified without making use of HTML elements preexisting within said at least one source document."

Moles teaches the claimed said specific-case terms are not so-identified based upon a determination of which terms are repeated within said at least one source

document; and said specific-case terms are so-identified without making use of HTML elements preexisting within said at least one source document (the display filter identifies sensitive information by comparing words, numbers, and graphics appearing on display 185 with a list of words, numbers, and graphics stored in a sensitive information database. [0031]

Bates and Moles are analogous art because they both teach about sanitizing a sensitive document.

It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Bates and use a database of sensitive information as taught by Moles to identify sensitive information and filter them. Modification provides a way to obscure the sensitive information by replacing the sensitive information with at least one of replacement text and replacement graphics. [0017]

As per claims 45, 95 and 104, Bates discloses displaying a subset of said source document and a corresponding subset of said proposed substitution document, showing selected particular proposed substitutions of general-case terms for specific-case terms. (Part of a source of said source document (52b) displaying proposed specific- case terms substitutions (56b) for general case term handicap (54b) [Fig. 3])

Bates does not explicitly teach “said specific-case terms are not so-identified based upon a determination of which terms are repeated within said at least one source document; and said specific-case terms are so-identified without making use of HTML elements preexisting within said at least one source document.”

Moles teaches the claimed said specific-case terms are not so-identified based upon a determination of which terms are repeated within said at least one source document; and said specific-case terms are so-identified without making use of HTML elements preexisting within said at least one source document (the display filter identifies sensitive information by comparing words, numbers, and graphics appearing on display 185 with a list of words, numbers, and graphics stored in a sensitive information database. [0031]

Bates and Moles are analogous art because they both teach about sanitizing a sensitive document.

It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Bates and use a database of sensitive information as taught by Moles to identify sensitive information and filter them. Modification provides a way to obscure the sensitive information by replacing the sensitive information with at least one of replacement text and replacement graphics. [0017]

As per claims 46 and 96, Bates discloses said at least one source document comprising a batch plurality of source documents (The composition program 14 searches specified portions of the document, Portion of text can include, paragraph, sentence or sub section. Multiple sentences make a paragraph, which can be seen as a batch plurality of source documents. [Column 3, lines 35-45]);

and said proposed substitution list comprising proposed substitutions for said batch plurality of source documents (proposed substitution list is available for batch of source documents [Fig.3]).

As per claims 47 and 97, Bates discloses further displaying for a particular general-case term and its related specific-case term, a numeric tally of how many times said particular general-case term is proposed to be substituted for said related specific-case term (52b shows the number of times general case of handicaps and satisfaction is proposed to be substituted for specific case terms shown on the list in 56a and 56b [Fig. 2 and 3]).

As per claims 48 and 98, Bates discloses undoing a proposed substitution previously selected by a user, by designating a proposed substitution to be undone, using a computerized input device (Further, a term highlighted in the "current associations" box 86 may be removed from the group of words associated with the term in the "association with" box 84 by selecting the "delete" pushbutton 90. [Column 4, lines 27-31]).

As per claims 49 and 99, Bates discloses adding a substitution by designating a substitution to be added, using a computerized input device (If the user selects the "add word" graphical button 60 in FIGS. 2 and 3, then the "associate term" dialog box 80 would be displayed as shown in FIG. 4. The user may enter a word in the "enter term" edit box 82 to associate with the term in the "associate with" box 84. [Column 4, lines 10-15]).

As per claims 50 and 100, Bates discloses modifying a proposed substitution by designating a proposed substitution to be modified, using a computerized input device (If the user selects the "add word" graphical button 60 in FIGS. 2 and 3, then the "associate term" dialog box 80 would be displayed as shown in FIG. 4. The user may enter a word in the "enter term" edit box 82 to associate with the term in the "associate with" box 84. [Column 4, lines 10-15]);

and entering a modification to said proposed substitution, using said computerized input device (whenever the term in the "associate with" 84 box is subsequently highlighted in the text box 52a, b (FIGS. 2, 3) as a repeated term, then the term added as an associated word through the "associate term" dialog box 80 will be displayed in the "with" box 56a, b in the com [Column 4, lines 32-37]).

Claims 2, 39, 52 and 89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates in view of Moles as applied to claims above, and further in view of US Patent Publication 5873660 issued to Walsh et al. (hereinafter "Walsh").

As per claims 2, 39, 52 and 89, Bates in view of Moles discloses the method of claim 1, said step of substituting (The replace box 54a displays the term highlighted in the text box 52a, e.g., "satisfaction" in FIG. 2, that the user may change with substitute terms displayed in a "with" window 56a [Column 3, lines 61-65])

Bates in view of Moles does not explicitly teach, "for all identified occurrences of a particular specific-case term, uniformly substituting a single general-case term therefor" as claimed.

Walsh teaches the claimed, for all identified occurrences of a particular specific-case term, uniformly substituting a general-case term therefor (when the find all word forms check box 88 is selected, the morphological replace tool 66 finds a next occurrence of any inflected form of the find word (which is contained within a single selected word wheel as described in more detail below). The replace all button 94 causes the tool 62, 66 to find and replace all occurrences of the find word that meet the selected criteria in the text document 54. [Col 6, 45-60])

Walsh and Bates in view of Moles are analogous art because they are both from the problem-solving area of editing text.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method as taught by Bates in view of Moles to uniformly substitute all identified occurrences as taught by Walsh. The find and replace all editing feature used in combination could easily find all occurrence of a word to be easily replaced. The editing tool and method is more likely to effect the word choice replacement intended by the user. [Col 3, lines 55-65])

Claims 3-6, 9-10, 19-20, 26-29, 32, 40-42, 53-56, 59-60, 69, 70, 76-79, 82, and 90-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates in view of Moles as applied to claims above, and further in view of US Patent Publication 20040034831 issued to Grober et al. (hereinafter "Grober").

As per claims 3 and 53, Grober discloses said specific-case terms comprise sensitive identifying terms to be sanitized from said at least one source document

(These "scripts" can manipulate UI field contents, e.g., causing the player to blank out certain fields, highlight others in sequence, substitute a fill-in field with a combo-box or, more generally, substitute an original UI with a different UI of similar purpose [0037]);

and said general-case terms comprise sanitization terms for concealing said sensitive identifying terms (These "scripts" can manipulate UI field contents, e.g., causing the player to blank out certain fields, highlight others in sequence, substitute a fill-in field with a combo-box or, more generally, substitute an original UI with a different UI of similar purpose [0037]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method as taught by Bates in view of Moles use sanitization terms for concealing sensitive identifying terms as taught by Grober. By blanking out fields, sensitive information is concealed. Modification provides improved methods and apparatus for enhancement. [0005] The player enhances the presentation by executing a script of effecting a state machine, e.g., providing wizard like operation [0014])

As per claim 4, 27, 40, 54, 77, and 90, Grober discloses displaying a form field in connection with each proposed substitution (presenting pop-ups, tables and dialog boxes and so forth to ease user understanding or use of the page [0037])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method as taught by Bates in view of Moles to use form fields for each proposed substitution as taught by Grober. It is designed to aid a client user in entering information. [0047] Modification provides improved methods and

apparatus for enhancement. [0005] The player enhances the presentation by executing a script of effecting a state machine, e.g., providing wizard like operation [0014])

As per claims 5, 28, 41, 55, 78, and 91, Grober discloses maintaining linkages among all form fields connected with the finalized substitutions for a particular specific-case term (linkages are maintained among fields, such as property address and current address with the finalized substitution of current address for property address [0054]);

entering a new specific-case term into one of the linked form fields using a computerized input device (The rules have automated this process by filling the property address with the value in "current address" automatically [0055]);

and automatically filing said new specific-case term into all of the form fields linked to said one of said linked form fields (the property address is the same as the current address, hence the rules automate this entry by automatically filling in the value for property address as indicated within the rules 78 [0054]).

As per claims 6, 29, 56, and 79, Grober discloses passing said linkages to a computerized form program. (the rules require for the loading and displaying of certain prompts. Additionally, because the type of mortgage is a refinance, the property address is the same as the current address [0055]);

and entering and automatically filling using said computerized form program (hence the rules automate this entry by automatically filling in the value for property address as indicated within the rules 78 [0055]).

As per claims 9 and 59, Grober discloses identifying specific-case terms further comprising the steps of: comparing terms in said at least one source document with

patterns in a pattern grammar database (some embodiments of the invention include functions, tables, stores, lists, controls or other invokable or addressable mechanisms to identify such HTML elements. Such a function, which can obviate the use of tags, may include a "hard-coded" list of identifiers or may effect a database or table look-up to identify such identifiers [0028]);

and identifying a term as a specific-case term based on said term matching a grammar pattern in said grammar pattern database (a grammar- based methodology can be used to identify UIs for enhancement [0029])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method as taught by Bates in view of Moles to use identify terms matching a grammar pattern in a grammar pattern database as taught by Grober. A grammar-based methodology is used in conjunction with either the hand-coding or recorder-based techniques. [0029] Modification provides improved methods and apparatus for enhancement. [0005] The player enhances the presentation by executing a script of effecting a state machine, e.g., providing wizard like operation [0014])

As per claims 10 and 60, Grober discloses grammar pattern is selected from the grammar group consisting of: a city, state, zip pattern; a city, state pattern, a price pattern, a name pattern; and a date pattern (The grammar methodology contains those grammar groups as further disclosed. [Paragraph 0029])

As per claims 19 and 69, Grober discloses classifying specific-case terms according to a plurality of types of specific-case terms (Classifying specific terms according to a plurality of types- such as name, address [0048]);

selecting which types of specific-case terms are to be identified for proposed substitution (The browser 16 creates the DOM 22 as described above. Here, that DOM is identified as element 52 representing the first HTML page of the loan application, is a directed graph indicating that there are four Uis [0048])

and identifying for proposed substitution, only terms which fall within one of the selected types of specific-case terms (Identifying in way of tags, Each of these UIs has an embedded tag, for example, name 54 has a tag with the value of "1" 62; address has a tag with the value of "2" 64, and so on [0048])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method as taught by Bates in view of Moles to use identify terms matching a grammar pattern in a grammar pattern database as taught by Grober. A grammar-based methodology is used in conjunction with either the hand-coding or recorder-based techniques. [0029] Modification provides improved methods and apparatus for enhancement. [0005] The player enhances the presentation by executing a script of effecting a state machine, e.g., providing wizard like operation [0014])

As per claims 20 and 70, Grober discloses plurality of types of specific-case terms is selected from at least two members of the specific-case type group consisting of: names; addresses; cities; states; countries; postal codes; dates; prices; collocations

rare words; and terms in sections of said at least one source document customarily containing specific-case terms (Specific cases selected from four UI's: name 54, current address 56, social security number 58 and type of loan desired 60. [0048])

As per claims 26 and 76, Grober discloses finalizing said at least one source document into a finalized document by initiating finalization, using a computerized input device document (These "scripts" can manipulate UI field contents, e.g., causing the player to blank out certain fields, highlight others in sequence, substitute a fill-in field with a combo-box or, more generally, substitute an original UI with a different UI of similar purpose [0037]);

and thereafter, barring a computerized output of said finalized document from revealing all specific-case terms for which substitutions have been made and finalized terms (according to the rules 78 for state-2 64, "prop address" and "price" are blocked, meaning that any entry in those UI will not be accepted. The rules have automated this process by filling the property address with the value in "current address" automatically. [0055])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method as taught by Bates in view of Moles to finalize a document for which substitutions have been made and finalized. Modification provides improved methods and apparatus for enhancement. [0005] The player enhances the presentation by executing a script of effecting a state machine, e.g., providing wizard like operation [0014])

As per claims 32 and 82, Grober discloses identifying said specific-case terms by scanning through a batch plurality of source documents, using said computer processor (the server 12 "serves" or uploads HTML data streams or web pages over a network or other remote communications device. See, step A [0031] the client browser 16, per convention it receives the HTML from the server 12 and parses it to generate the document object model, or DOM 22. See, step B. It includes representations of the conventional HTML elements contained in the web page, as well as tags embedded therein. [0034]);

proposing substitutions of general-case terms for the identified specific- case terms in said batch plurality of source documents, also using said computer processor (enhancements effected by the player can include highlighting UI objects on the client computer 18 console, filling-in fields, selecting radio buttons, setting sliders, and the like--all based on text, graphics and/or formatting information directly encoded within the tags or referenced thereby [0036]);

and displaying the proposed substitutions for said batch plurality of source documents, on said computerized display device (enhancements effected by the player can include highlighting UI objects on the client computer 18 console [0036]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method as taught by Bates in view of Moles to scan through a batch plurality of source documents and proposing substitutions for identified terms. The tags are then identified and the presentation is enhanced based thereon. Modification provides improved methods and apparatus for enhancement. [0005] The

player enhances the presentation by executing a script of effecting a state machine, e.g., providing wizard like operation [0014])

As per claims 42 and 92, Grober discloses barring a computerized output of said finalized document from revealing all specific-case terms for which substitutions have been made and finalized terms (according to the rules 78 for state-2 64, "prop address" and "price" are blocked, meaning that any entry in those UI will not be accepted. The rules have automated this process by filling the property address with the value in "current address" automatically. [0055])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method as taught by Bates in view of Moles to finalize a document for which substitutions have been made and finalized. Modification provides improved methods and apparatus for enhancement. [0005] The player enhances the presentation by executing a script of effecting a state machine, e.g., providing wizard like operation [0014])

Claims 31, 81, 44, and 94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates in view of Moles as applied to claims above, and further in view of US Patent 5890177 issued to Moody et al. (hereinafter "Moody").

As per claims 31 and 81, Bates in view of Moles discloses displaying at least part of said at least one source document on said computerized display device (Part of a source of said source document (52b) [Fig. 3]);

displaying within said at least one source document, said specific-case terms for which it is proposed to substitute said general-case terms (displaying proposed specific-case terms substitutions (56b) for general case term handicap (54b) [Fig. 3]);

further displaying on said computerized display device, at least part of a proposed substitution document (Part of a source of said source document (52b) [Fig. 3]);

Bates in view of Moles does not explicitly disclose displaying within said proposed substitution document, said proposed substitutions, with sections of said at least one source document containing said specific-case terms, juxtaposed relative to sections of said at least one containing said general-case terms to facilitate comparison between said sections

Moody discloses the claimed with sections of said at least one source document containing said specific-case terms, juxtaposed relative to sections of said at least one containing said general-case terms to facilitate comparison between said sections (The edited copies are then retrieved and compared and a single marked-up document is created in which sections of the original document and corresponding sections of each of the edited documents (with changes from the original document indicated) are displayed in physically adjacent locations of the display screen. [Col 2, lines 35-40]

Bates in view of Moles and Moody are analogous art because they are in the same field of endeavor of text editing.

It would have been obvious to combine Bates in view of Moles to include the teachings of Moody to facilitate comparison by having two document sections side by

side. Modification provides a unique, automated comparison routine is used to compare the multiple edited document copies with the original document

As per claims 44 and 94, Bates in view of Moles discloses the method and computerized apparatus of claims 43 and 93 respectively (See rejections to claims 43 and 93 above);

Bates in view of Moles does not explicitly disclose displaying within said proposed substitution document, said proposed substitutions, with sections of said at least one source document containing said specific-case terms, juxtaposed relative to sections of said at least one containing said general-case terms to facilitate comparison between said sections

Moody discloses the claimed with sections of said at least one source document containing said specific-case terms, juxtaposed relative to sections of said at least one containing said general-case terms to facilitate comparison between said sections (The edited copies are then retrieved and compared and a single marked-up document is created in which sections of the original document and corresponding sections of each of the edited documents (with changes from the original document indicated) are displayed in physically adjacent locations of the display screen. [Col 2, lines 35-40]

Bates in view of Moles and Moody are analogous art because they are in the same field of endeavor of text editing.

It would have been obvious to combine Bates in view of Moles to include the teachings of Moody to facilitate comparison by having two document sections side by

side. Modification provides a unique, automated comparison routine is used to compare the multiple edited document copies with the original document

Claims 24 and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over to Bates et al (hereinafter "Bates") in view of Moles, further in view of US Patent 6047300 issued to Walfish et al. (hereinafter Walfish)

As per claims 24 and 74, Bates in view of Moles discloses the method of claim 1, (See rejection to claim 1 above)

Bates in view of Moles does not explicitly teach, "overriding a proposed substitution; learning from said overriding using machine learning; and thereafter, applying said machine learning to said step of proposing substitutions.

Walfish teaches the claimed overriding a proposed substitution (The spelling correction user interface corrects the misspelled word by replacing it with the correctly spelled alternate word. User can override the proposed solution by options "ignore," "ignore all," "delete," and "add to spelling dictionary" [Column 1, lines 30-42]);

and thereafter, applying said machine learning to said step of proposing substitutions (by applying ignore all, or add to spelling dictionary, machine can ignore all such instances of the word or not highlight the word to be corrected by the spell checker [Column 1, lines 30-42]).

Bates in view of Moles and Walfish are analogous art because they are both from the problem-solving area automatic text processing.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method as taught by Bates in view of Moles to apply machine learning to proposed substitutions. An association group provides a group of terms and associated words. [Column 3, lines 50-53] . To maintain the word as entered, the automatic replacement of the "misspelled" word must be overridden. [Column 1, lines 61-67] Modification provides subsequent occurrences of the misspelled word may be corrected using the AutoCorrect List rather than repeating the comparison steps of the spelling embodiment. [Column 3, lines 55-63])

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ann J. Chempakaseril whose telephone number is 571-272-9767. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 9-4. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ann J Chempakaseril/
Examiner, Art Unit 2166
April 25, 2008

/Hosain T Alam/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2166